

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: December 18, 2000
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
December 14, 2000

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Jay Cerveny | City of La Center Council Member (P) |
| Paul Dennis | City of Camas, Council Member |
| Dean Dossett | City of Camas Mayor (P) |
| William Ganley | City of Battle Ground Mayor |
| Jeanne Harris | City of Vancouver Council Member (A) |
| John Idsinga | City of Battle Ground Council Member (P) |
| Betty Sue Morris | Clark County Board of Commissioners |
| Craig Pridemore | Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair) |
| Jim Robertson | Town of Yacolt Mayor (P) |
| | (P) Primary (A) Alternate |

Public:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Marnie Allen | Clark County Schools |
| Ken Hadley | Self |
| Chris Hartke | Hartke & Company |
| Steve Horenstein | MillerNash |
| Tom Jacobs | Cascade SE Neighborhood Association |
| Dean Lookingbill | RTC |
| Alison Mielke | Friends of Clark County |
| Shawn Moore | Hopper & Dennis, PLLC |
| Keith Pfeifer | Self |
| Bart Phillips | CREDC |
| Randy Printz | Landerholm Law Firm |
| Ole Rasmussen | Self |
| Bud Van Cleve | NE Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association |
| Paul West | Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce |

Staff:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Jose Alvarez | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Monty Anderson | City of Washougal Planning Director |
| Bill Barron | Clark County Administrator |
| Derek Chisholm | City of Vancouver Long Range Planning |
| Tamara DeRidder | City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager |
| Eric Eisemann | Cities of La Center & Ridgefield |
| Lianne Forney | Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director |
| Mike Haggerty | C-TRAN |
| Bob Higbie | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Eric Holmes | City of Battle Ground Planning Director |
| Mary Keltz | Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office |
| Patrick Lee | Clark County Long Range Planning Manager |
| Rich Lowry | Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney |
| Dale Miller | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Oliver Orjiako | Clark County Long Range Planning |
| Marty Snell | City of Camas Planning Manager |
| Brian Snodgrass | City of Vancouver Planner |
| Josh Warner | Clark County Community Development |
| Phil Wuest | Clark County Long Range Planning |

1. Roll call / Introductions

Called to order at 3:00 PM by Commissioner Craig Pridemore. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

2. Review October 18 and October 26 Steering Committee Notes (If available).

No corrections or comments

3. Update on activities outside of the steering committee

1. Revision of schedule – the GMA update issues will be before the Planning Commission in February. There will be joint public testimony before the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners.
2. Decisions will probably be made by the Board in March
3. TAC figures are being reviewed by group to cover methodology

4. Distribute public opinion survey

There were 421 community member surveys conducted at random. The surveys resulted in some interesting and conflicting goals. People wanted design standards,

more industrial jobs and job growth close to people's homes. Pridemore suggests this can be look at in more detail at another meeting if desired. Idsinga wants it on January agenda. Pridemore says the pollster who conducted the surveys will be invited to the meeting.

5. Reconsideration of 60/40 and 6/16 issues

Lee gave a brief introduction by reviewing the new housing policy paper. Page 2 of housing policy document has table of the options available. General options are to have 60/40 split intertwined with the comprehensive plan goals including 6/16. See the policy paper for a list of options. Eisemann and Snodgrass will go through the options in detail.

Harris asks about density averaging. She wants to know if density numbers prior to 1994 can be obtained or calculated. Lee responds that 1994 is the best data available. Harris wants density to be reviewed in the entire UGB. If we do not look at this we could now be creating pockets of undesired densities if we do not have an accurate picture of actual density. Orjiako says we have not looked at it from time 0. If we include before 1994 it would probably be lower density than numbers we have now. Harris wants a more real picture and looking at 5 – 10 year blocks could create pockets. This could have potential issues with Vancouver annexation. Lee says we can possibly do the calculation before the next meeting.

Morris says that former times may have had more density. Dennis says they (Camas) have done some of the numbers. Pridemore questions the necessity of the numbers because we are looking to the future. The number are not necessary unless we are looking at redevelopment. Dennis says it is looking at the historic character. Harris says it can give an area density credit. Dossett says it will allow us to look at entire community and not just vacant lands and it will help do redevelopment. Pridemore says there are no provisions for redevelopment in the comprehensive plan and people in the development community have advocated for this lack of redevelopment policy to date. He is in favor of looking at redevelopment, but is concerned about staff time. DeRidder says the calculations can be done, but they would need to make assumptions and time. Orjiako says we can do it to with assumptions and knowing what the former zoning was. DeRidder says they can go back to OFM base data to identify some numbers. Eisemann asks about time. Morris asks why we need the zoning from past times. Orjiako says we need to see what was actually built in the zones.

Eisemann and Holmes present about language changes from the TAC. Try to begin to find common-ground that can be agreed. The ideas are discussed in a December 7th WPS memo. Page 2 of draft shows areas of agreement between cities. Feeling is that 60/40 change called "cities proposal." All jurisdictions take an equitable distribution. See the memo for details. The recommended goals were presented by Eisemann.

Snodgrass talks through some of the specific language in the December 7 memo in the packet. The details are in the memo. This would go under the community framework plan. The goals put the jurisdictions into different tiers.

A document from the City of Vancouver was handed out at the meeting, but was not necessarily agreed to by all other jurisdictions. It addresses enforcement. The memo presents the different options if certain goals are not met at specific points in time. The process based policy did have some discussion among the jurisdictions, but has not necessarily been agreed to

Snell goes through a Camas memo that was handed out at the meeting and dated December 14, 2000. It presents several new options in the memo. Dossett follows up by saying he is not necessarily opposed to numerical standards, but other counties do not use them. Dossett wants more flexibility in meeting the goals. Small cities have a different growth pattern and the evolution of the growth is being forced by the current goals. He feels that policies need to be balanced with a realistic approach to what should be expected. They cannot do 20 years of work in 5 years. He suggests that we need to look back to see if the original goals were realistic. Work together and not have more enforcement mechanisms.

Harris responds that Vancouver does not have a problem with 75/25, but there needs to be some sort of a balance in the multi/single development especially with housing/jobs balance. Dossett says the growth in population that takes place does not determine where the people will work, but only that they live in Clark County. Many people work in Portland. We cannot control where they work. Pridemore says the TAC has come to some middle ground and this issue is somewhat resolved.

Morris says that Camas is not receptive to new enforcement methods. Dossett agrees. He does not have staff to enforce with other jurisdictions. Pridemore asks about enforcement to Harris. Harris says that Vancouver does not want to oversee the enforcement it is recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. Dossett likes the italicized policies (from the memo) without enforcement. Harris says that is ok too. She does want the county to have some sort of enforcement mechanism. Morris asks Lowry about the beginning of the housing/jobs debate. The issue is where that people live and sharing revenue if more jobs and houses. Lowry says there would need to be enabling language in order for funds to be transferred or spent in other jurisdictions, not under an inter-local agreement. There would need to be an authorizing statute to spend money in another jurisdiction.

Harris asks Dossett about 75/25 and Dossett says he would accept that, but there might be better ways to meet the goals. He wants more flexibility. There are many

differences in the cities geographically and economically. He wants to be able to keep individual identities. Harris supports 75/25. Pridemore asks about moving the UGB if you reach the 75%. Lowry says GMA talks about overall density, not single/multi-family proportions. Pridemore is pointing out that all single-family could be built under the policy proposal.

Morris does not like the policies because of the density possibly flowing to Hazel Dell if the number is 8 units per acre. The hearings would be ugly. Snodgrass says that the densities are already there and it would not need an increase.

Pridemore says the issue is agreed. No enforcement.

6. Population and Employment projections and allocation methodology.

Wuest presents with Orjiako. Mailed long memo on the subject to the committee (the documents are dated November 30 and December 1). Wuest presented the highlights. These reflect revisions from OFM. The numbers are in the report and the summary. There is some info on historical growth in Clark County. Current OFM numbers were based on high range and was 5% below where we are now (345,000). Looking at 40 years, 3.3% growth rate is the average. The key things to look at are : how to plan and where to allocate the growth.

Orjiako highlights issues. Employment data from one specific source is not required by GMA. The numbers were generated internally. A 2/1 ratio was used (two people in population/one job). They previously used the medium OFM projection. These were the status quo assumptions. Also looked at congestion as a deterrent to jobs in other places. Need to decide the time-frame. Employment info says the status quo will add 58,000 new jobs. With lower commuting it is closer to 75,000. Use these numbers to look at the current land supply available. Based on numbers there will need to be more commercial lands, about 3,000 acres. Industrial lands seem adequate. If the high number is used we need over 4,000 acres, but industrial is still ok. Actual deficit is 2,000 acres under this scenario. The deficit numbers are county-wide and it needs to be determined where to allocate these within the county.

Morris asks about the allocation method. Orjiako responds that the allocation is based on a ratio of 2/1. There is no allocation yet. Wuest says that employment is based on vacant and underutilized lands. There is not good enough data to do it by individual jurisdiction. The allocation is only a framework. Morris asks if a jurisdiction wants more allocation what do we do. Wuest says the numbers look only at capacity.

Idsinga says it should look at geographic location. Lee says this memo is only an example and is not a proposal yet. Pridemore says that allocation of rural people can be done by jurisdiction. The assumptions are documented and may be different from 1994.

Dennis asks if they want more industrial jobs they need more industry jobs. Wuest says the numbers are from plan monitoring, not the CREDC report. Page 6 and 7 show the alternative scenarios. Pridemore says that population may not be the way to allocate the jobs. Morris asks if this is historic. What if La Center wants to grow faster. How do they get there from this comprehensive plan. Wuest responds that the Board of Commissioners determines the parameters. Pridemore says there would need to be a change in the framework plan. Lee says the question is something that will need to be addressed in the next stage of the process. Pridemore says that these are framework plan issues. These decisions have ramification on infrastructure. Orjiako adds that the assumptions are in the report. He asks if the assumptions want to be discussed by the committee, particularly the number of jobs per acre. Portland is 43/acre in downtown.

Pridemore asks how we should move forward in instructing staff. How large of population should we shoot for. Morris says to give the cities some time to look at the issues. Pridemore agrees. Some cities are in the public process now. Morris says it is an important element for the cities to go through. She feels they need to hit straight on about moving UGBs. What population forecast do we chose. Morris says they do not need to look the same. Ganley says they need time to do the public process. Pridemore says we (the steering committee and the cities) are on different timelines. County staff has been spending time. Pridemore sees us as starting somewhat at the beginning because cities need to do more visioning. Morris says it does not set it back very far. Ganley says Battle Ground is not that far behind. Nor are other cities. Vancouver will wait for the numbers. DeRidder says to look at capital facilities and how far can we afford to grow. Camas can adopt its new vision in December 2001. As will Vancouver. Camas is going to have a policy discussion on UGB expansion. This is only a discussion. Lee says that key decision is what population level are we planning for. Does not need to wait until after individual plans are completed. Cities need the county population forecast.

Can they make the population process in January. Pridemore asks about the Planning Commission schedule. Morris asks if it is a Board of Commissioner's decision or for the broader group. There could be consensus in the Steering Committee, but no voting. The Board of Commissioners must make the decision. Morris wants to push this forward. Lee says that the process outlined to date is scheduled for a decision in March with Planning Commission in February. Need to look at vacant buildable lands inventory. Decision can be in March unless reasons to delay the process.

Holmes says their vision is more than 20 years. They are looking at 50 years out. Wuest says the number that they use as a baseline in the beginning may change before they are complete because of new census numbers being released. Staff see this as an iterative process. The final work in March is not the final word. Dossett asks if there are indications of where we should go. Wuest says to look at forecasting you need to go forward and far as you go back (in number of years you include for a forecast). There is a table in the memo that shows annual, five year, etc, growth numbers.

7. Technical Advisory Committee Update

No other TAC issues than were already discussed

8. Set Next meeting time and date.

The time and date of the next meeting will be set in the future. Commissioner Morris will be chair of the steering committee in 2001.

9. Adjourn

The Steering Committee adjourned at 5:00 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - december 14 2000.doc